DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 846 TM 006 731

AUTHOR	Lewis, Robert
TITLE	The Use of Expert Judgment in the Assessment of Demonstrated Learning in the Antioch College-Yellow Springs Adult Degree Completion Program. CAEL Institutional Report No. 1. Antioch College.
INSTITUTION	Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning Project, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Sep 75
NOTE	81p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning, American City Building, Suite 403, Columbia, Maryland 21044 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; Case Studies (Education); College Credits; College Students; Educational Policy; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluators; Guidelines; Higher Education; Individualized Curriculum; Informal Assessment; Interviews; *Knowledge Level; Learning Experience; *Special Degree Programs; *Standards; Student Application; *Student Evaluation; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS	*Adult Degree Completion Program; Antioch College OH; Experiential Learning; Performance Based Certification

ABSTRACT

The implementation of the Adult Degree Completion Program (ADCP) at Antioch-Yellow Springs is described. The ADCP is a transfer program designed to enable adults who have never finished college to complete their undergraduate degree work, often without having to abandon their obligations to families or to professions. To enroll in the program, applicants must: be at least 25 years old, have spent at least two years as homemakers, employees, or community service volunteers, have successfully completed at least one year of college, and have not attended college in the past two years. Eight case studies illustrate the evaluation criteria used by Antioch College faculty evaluators to determine the amount of equivalent college credit earned. Concerns expressed by faculty members regarding this evaluation include: (1) the need for supporting materials from students, (2) the amount of faculty contact necessary for effective evaluation, and (3) the need for clear communication with students regarding their demonstrated learning. Forms used for crediting demonstrated learning and for documenting agreements regarding degree requirements are appended. (MV)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED148846

TM006 731

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

cael

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CAEL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Institutional Report No. 1
Antioch College, Yellow Springs

THE USE OF EXPERT JUDGMENT IN THE ASSESSMENT OF DEMONSTRATED LEARNING IN THE ANTIOCH COLLEGE YELLOW SPRINGS ADULT DEGREE COMPLETION PROGRAM

COOPERATIVE ASSESSMENT
OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

COOPERATIVE ASSESSMENT OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING (CAEL)

is a joint project of Educational Testing Service and a group of colleges and universities with initial funding by the Carnegie Corporation:

Antioch College
California State University and Colleges
(San Francisco State University)
Community College of Vermont
El Paso Community College
Empire State College
Florida International University
Massachusetts State College System
(Framingham State College)
Minnesota Metropolitan State College
New College (University of Alabama)
Thomas A. Edison College

Please address inquiries to: CAEL
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08540

CAEL Institutional Report No. 1

Antioch College

THE USE OF EXPERT JUDGMENT IN THE ASSESSMENT OF DEMONSTRATED LEARNING IN THE ANTIOCH COLLEGE-YELLOW SPRINGS ADULT DEGREE COMPLETION PROGRAM

This Institutional Report is one of a series (No. 1 through No. 5) reporting selected CAEL Special Project work carried out during 1974-75. These reports are preliminary documents reproduced as received from the institutions. They do not necessarily represent the views of the CAEL Steering Committee, but the materials are recommended for experimental use. Following tryout and review in 1975-76, they will be revised prior to final publication. Reactions and suggestions regarding the content of this report will be appreciated.

Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning

September 1975

Copyright (c) 1975 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

This Institutional Report was prepared at Antioch College by:

Robert Lewis, Project Director
Elaine Comegys, Associate Project Director
Loraine Shepard, Associate Project Director
Shannon Groves, Special Assistant

The following Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty contributed articles:

Robert Bieri
Richard Carpenter
Alvin Denman
Jewel Graham
William John
Donald Myatt
Philip Rothman
Joseph Schenk
Walter Tulecke

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Adult Degree Program and Antioch College	3
	ADCP Goals and the Antioch Tradition	3
	How the ADCP Works	11
III.	Faculty Workshops on Evaluation of Demonstrated Learning	17
IV.	Case Studies	33
V.	Some Questions of Educational Policy and Quality Control	58
VI.	Supporting Documents	
	A. Demonstrated Learning Evaluation Forms (3A and 3B)	64
	B. Samples of Completed Demonstrated Learning Forms (3A and 3B)	66
	C. Memo on Demonstrated Learning Credits for Nurses	68
	D. ADCP Degree Program Agreement (Form 6)	70

I. INTRODUCTION

This handbook grows from the goals and efforts of two organizations. The first is the Antioch-Yellow Springs Adult Degree Completion Program (ADCP), initiated in the Fall of 1973, and registering its first students in the Spring of the same academic year. The second is the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning (CAEL), founded and planned during that year. In one sense the needs of both organizations seemed to be met by the project which resulted in this handbook. CAEL realized the necessity of exploring the use of expert judgment in the assessment of prior learning; Antioch-Yellow Springs wanted to conduct a series of faculty workshops to explore questions arising from the evaluation of prior learning of the students of the new ADCP.

It is hoped however, that the present handbook might be useful not only to persons involved just with Antioch or with CAEL. It is probable that the inclusion of adults into the student bodies of American institutions on a scale much greater than that encompassed by current extension, evening, or general studies divisions will be one of the main educational innovations of the 70's and 80's. Paramount to this dynamic change in the limits of educational opportunities for adults is the problem of evaluation of academic knowledge they have achieved outside of college or university classrooms. And tantamount to success in carrying out such evaluation will be cooperation in the venture by the faculties of the institutions involved as well as their support, their encouragement, and their belief that the education achieved through the programs is of the same quality as that achieved by all students in their institutions. Without active faculty support, the new programs run the risk of losing the respectable academic basis necessary for acceptance by serious adult students as well

as numerical success.

The current report proposes to describe, in however a brief and summary fashion, the manner in which the faculty of Antioch College, an institution already well known for its innovative ventures in new educational dimensions, was able to meet the needs of a new category of students while, at the same time, continuing its traditions of educational excellence.

It is hoped that this report will serve as an informational resource for faculty and students at Antioch-Yellow Springs, but also, and perhaps more importantly, for faculties, students and administrators in other institutions as well. This will not occur by adopting or adapting our procedures, but only if our methods, our premises, our successes, and what might be judged to be our failures, help to point the way for each institution to work out in its own special fashion the solutions to its unique program and assessment needs and those of the adult students it expects to serve.

II. THE ADULT DEGREE COMPLETION PROGRAM AND ANTIOCH COLLEGE

ADCP Goals and the Antioch Tradition

As a basis for establishing the Adult Degree Completion Program, Antioch-Yellow Springs already had considerable experience with the philosophy of extending the parameters of traditional liberal arts college education, as well as with implementing such expansion. Several well established Antioch traditions made the creation of the ADCP and the evaluation of academic learning achieved outside of regular classrooms seem more like an extension of current college policies than like some bold new venture in unknown educational directions. These traditions were: (A) over 50 years of experience in planning, administering, and evaluating alternating work and study programs leading to the Bachelor's Degree; (B) faculty and administrative commitment to individualized education and to the belief that, regardless of the standards the institution may require of its students, the education of each student is unique, cannot be limited or defined by requirements alone, and must be planned and implemented by mutual consent and enterprise between student, teachers, and administrators; (C) that a student's education progresses best under the assumption of maturity and motivation on the part of the student; (D) that Independent Study is not just a reward for Honors Students or Graduate Students preparing theses or dissertations, but should be available to a wide group of students; (E) that a rigid system of evaluating the quality of students' learning through grades frequently not only distorts, but also hinders, their immediate learning process and their on-going educational achievement.

Since, as the ADCP was planned, initiated, and administered during the past 20 months, these traditions have been foremost in the minds of the planning

committee, the faculty, and the staff of the program, a brief description of each concept, especially in relationship to the evaluation of demonstrated learning, would be useful.

A. The belief that education can be undertaken by alternating periods of on-campus study with off-campus work experience has been in practice for over 50 years at Antioch since Arthur Morgan initiated the cooperative work-study plan in the 20's. Completion of a specified number of experiential credits through the Center for Experiential Education (CEE) continues to be a requirement for graduation from Antioch. At regular intervals during a student's stay at the College, the CEE carries out interviews and evaluations of the co-op experience. It is important, however, not to confuse the terms "work experience," or a frequently offered substitute, "life experience," for either the requirements of the CEE at Antioch-Yellow Springs, or the crediting of academic knowledge through demonstrated learning. <u>One of the most unique features of the Yellow Springs Campus, and one which has been continued in the ADCP, has been the separation of academic and experiential credit</u>.

In establishing the ADCP the main goal was to create a realistic mechanism by which adults with either part-time or full-time responsibilities at work or at home would be able to complete their degree requirements, both co-op and academic. It was further agreed that many of the adults would have acquired a considerable amount of knowledge, which might indeed be the equivalent of classroom academic knowledge, but for which we had no comprehensive method of evaluation and crediting. We also assumed that most if not all of the prospective students would have completed at least the equivalent of the 18-24 months cooperative work required by Antioch-Yellow Springs for graduation.

Our goals, then, in interviewing the students, were based on the realization

that work experience, providing that sufficient documentation be submitted, should not and would not have to be continued as part of an alternative work-study plan. Of the approximately 80 students admitted at the time of this writing, one was found not to have completed the co-op requirement before entrance, and is planning to do a co-op quarter before graduation.

It must be noted that several of the students in fact combine work and study in including part of either their jobs or special interest activities into courses or projects which they are taking on campus. Yet we recognized that many of the students entering the program might well have acquired academic knowledge while working. A vice-president of a savings and loan association with 20 years experience in investments, small business management, real estate law, accounting, money and banking, etc., in all probability would have learned the material covered in college courses with similar names or titles. In this sense the "work experience" provided the basis for two components of the Antioch-Yellow Springs degree. The CEE Department decided that the candidate's long-term experience in working in the banking field indeed more than satisfied the Department's requirements for graduation, while the respective faculty who teach the courses mentioned above evaluated the candidate's knowledge in these academic areas. Thus the separation of academic and work credit by each area was felt to be most useful in the new program.

The CEE Department conducts an interview during the required on-campus pre-admission conferences to determine the completion of the co-op credits. In recognizing the necessity of a suitable mechanism for evaluating nonclassroom achieved academic learning, the ADCP Committee also realized the importance of maintaining the same standards of faculty expertise that operates in the undergraduate residential program. Therefore it was decided that any eval-

uations of academic knowledge in the program could not be processed administratively, but rather would be done by those Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty who teach in respective disciplines. In the case mentioned above the evaluations were carried out by the Departments of Administration and Economics. Thus the extension into the ADCP of joint but separate evaluations, first by the Center for Experiential Education, and then by the Academic faculty, continues the uniqueness of work-study without obliterating the boundaries between them. It also takes into account a factor that the ADCP Committee sensed as a prerequisite for the program's success at Antioch-Yellow Springs (and perhaps elsewhere for similar programs), that evaluations be carried out by the faculty recognized by the College as possessing the professional expertise in the given fields.

B. Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty, students, and administrators have found over the years that educational excellence and educational flexibility go together. Surviving the frequently bitter educational wars has been one uncontested principle: education progresses best when dedicated professionals and earnest students are given maximum freedom and encouragement to explore new ways of teaching and learning. Realizing that the informal education of adults probably would have comprised and most probably augmented the blend of work and study that had traditionally formed the basis of an Antioch education, the Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty involved in the establishment of the ADCP wanted to preserve the same mixture of academic excellence and individual exploration which has developed on the campus. We therefore assumed that much of the academic knowledge learned on campus either by classroom attendance or through independent study might well have been achieved in different manners by entering adult students.

Indeed the very nature of many daily enterprises carried on by adults suggests either a traditional course, or a specially sponsored field study. The amateur photographer or the professional photo-lab technician, the actor in amateur or professional performances, an army specialist in data processing, a volunteer director of a local mental health program, a young mother who has studied a particular method of natural childbirth--all of these may well have undergone, both in time and in quality, processes so similar to hundreds of on-going college courses or special projects that a faculty already trained in these fields and experienced with students who have combined work and academic study could be expected to be able to make an assessment of the knowledge gained through the experiences and translate it into academic credits. Therefore, both to ensure the academic rigor of the evaluation and to maintain the capacity for exploration, identification, and evaluation of individual non-classroom achieved learning, the ADCP established a process through which each individual's uniquely achieved education is translated, by recognized experts, into commonly accepted academic credits. This process involved the students' demonstration of academic knowledge or skills and, hence, resulted in what we termed Demonstrated Learning credits.

C. Antioch-Yellow Springs has always placed stress on the concept that education takes place best when directed by a strong sense of self-motivation. This does not mean that students should be left to themselves to struggle through improperly worked-out programs. Indeed the courses offered on the campus compare favorably in rigor of standards, volume of required work, and difficulty of faculty assessment with similar institutions. But Antioch-Yellow Springs holds that, within broad parameters, the necessary precondition for successful learning be interest rather than specific requirement. We therefore affirmed

that many of the students entering the ADCP would have achieved, through a combination of maturity and interest, levels of academic learning equal to those accomplished in the classrooms. A 50-year-old journeyman printer whose hobby had been prison reform might well be expected to have learned what would have been presented in courses titled "Prison as a Social Institution," "Criminology," "Penology," "The Organization of Rehabilitation Services," etc. A 55-year-old machine foreman has demonstrated a grasp of clear written expository style in the preparation of technical reports to managing engineers that equals if not surpasses the levels of writing achieved by an 18-year-old freshman who has slugged his/her way through English I. A 27-year-old nurse who, with a physician, has been in charge of a team of specialists in the mental health ward of a large state hospital may well have learned the material usually covered in a senior project in abnormal psychology, in a course called, "Administration of Public Health Services," or in counseling. In many cases faculty evaluate the ADCP students' work with the attitude of a graduate school "reader" or director. The evaluations often transcend the usual relationship of student/teacher and enter into the level of discussions between specialists with different backgrounds.

D. The mechanism for independent study under the direction of a single teacher, especially in a one-to-one relationship, is one of the oldest heritages of the educational processes of all civilizations. It has been part of a variety of institutions, although the modern college and university, specifically in this country, has limited its application, scope, and availability. In the Middle Ages it occurred in the workshops of the artisans and in the studios of the artists. In the monasteries it operated through private study followed by an on-going process of evaluation by elders. The universities, however, for

a long time excluded the possibility of practically learned knowledge. It was the latter half of the last century before the notion developed that independently learned knowledge acquired extramurally could belong to the college curriculum. Even now in most institutions, the advanced field study, the "senior project," the Master's Degree and the Ph.D. research project, in which the student finally receives institutional permission to apply his/her knowledge, comes only at the end of the educational process. Furthermore it is restricted numerically and is treated more as a reward for the privileged rather than as a valuable tool for general as well as specialized education. At Antioch-Yellow Springs the tradition has been to encourage independent study and academic internships throughout the student's undergraduate program.

Thus, in opening a program for adults who planned to complete their education, provision had to be made for the fact that in many instances the traditional order of classroom general education preceding independently studied field specialization might well have been reversed. Furthermore, much of the learning may have already occurred in the form of independent study either as specialized field study, or subjects usually considered as part of a general education requirement. The ADCP Committee therefore provided for this possibility by allowing and encouraging the exploration of non-sponsored individualized education, i.e., prior independent study, as part of the mechanisms of achieving credit for entrance into the program.

E. The issue of grades versus non-grades continues to be debated on campus. At the time of this writing, the official policy is that each student either receives or doesn't receive credit for a course. In addition to receiving a written evaluation from the instructor, the student may also ask for and receive a letter grade. In practice, Antioch-Yellow Springs continues the

widest variety of types of evaluations and yet is able to maintain extremely high academic standards, as witnessed, among other factors, by its placing ninth in the country in the percentage of applying students who are accepted in medical schools. Therefore, the ADCP Committee had the greatest confidence that the same faculty that so successfully combines effective teaching and accurate assessment with a minimum of institutional standardization would continue to do so in evaluating the prior learning of students in the ADCP.

Indeed the absence of grades and of the pressures of competitive examinations continue to function as a facilitator of learning identification. Students who for years associated institutionalized education with rankings and comparisons of performance against seemingly unreachable standards now find themselves confronted not by examiners but by educators interested in what they have learned as individuals. It has always been Antioch Yellow Springs' belief that since learning can be achieved through a variety of processes, that a multitude of approaches to identification may be needed in order to assess and transcript this learning. Thus the evaluation of past nonacademically achieved learning in the ADCP enjoys the advantages of academic rigor and individual flexibility available to regular Antioch-Yellow Springs students. In response to a recent questionnaire sent to ADCP students about their reactions to demonstrated learning credits, they replied that they were proud to have them on their transcripts and felt that they had been earned legitimately. At the same time they noted the special skill and attention which characterized the faculty's role in the evaluations, a role encompassed both in helping the student reassess some experiences from which academic knowledge had indeed been derived and in carefully showing the student the difference between experience and learning.

How the ADCP Works

In order to understand the process of evaluating and crediting demonstrated learning, it would be useful to present a summary of how the ADCP works in general. While the summary will try to focus on the crediting of past learning, it also will cover other aspects of the program's operations.

1. General Nature and Purpose of the ADCP. The ADCP is a transfer program designed to enable adults who have started but not finished college, to complete their undergraduate degree work, often without having to abandon their obligations to families or to professions.

2. Prerequisites for Entrance into the ADCP. There are four requirements:

a) The program is for people who are at least 25 years old.

b) At least two years of experience as employees, homemakers, self-employed persons, or sustained community service volunteers.

c) Successful completion of at least one year of college. The ADCP committee wanted both the College and the applicants to have sufficient evidence that they could successfully carry on college work, especially since the difficulty of such work would in all probability be compounded by the maintenance of concurrent work and family obligations, and by the lack of the constant classroom supervision available to full-time resident undergraduates.

d) No full-time matriculated college attendance in the past two years. The program was not intended to draw regular students from other institutions, or from Antioch-Yellow Springs, but rather to offer the possibilities of completion to those who had, in actuality, interrupted their degree work.

3. A Commitment to Completion. The ADCP encourages application by students who are reasonably certain that they can complete their education. The fee structure, by which students pay $1,000 the first quarter of study, $500 the

second and third quarters, and $400 the fourth, regardless of the number of credits for which they register, with subsequent study (up to 60 credits) done without payment, makes the program financially disadvantageous for anyone who just wants to try out a college course or two. In fact, our advice to students who tell us that they are not sure of their sense of commitment to completion, or to students whose total prior crediting suggests that they can't complete the work in the required three year period and maintain their work or family obligations, is to take courses at extension divisions, evening dividions, or schools of general studies at other institutions, usually at much lower fees per credit hour. If a sense of satisfaction and commitment is thereby gained, we then encourage the prospective student to apply to the ADCP. This commitment to completion acts as a filter on potential applicants. It is our belief and intention that students who simply wanted to get the easiest kind of crediting for "life experiences," would not apply to the ADCP. Again, in this respect, the crediting of demonstrated learning is entered on the student's transcript only upon completion of all of the other requirements for graduation.

In talking with students, and as part of a response to a recent survey undertaken by one of the ADCP students as an independent study, we have found this commitment to completion to be the basis for positive student reactions. They consider that they will have earned a difficult degree, that their demonstrated learning credits resulted from true academic knowledge, and that they have a strong sense of achievement for having undergone the evaluation process.

4. Admissions Procedures. Students entering the ADCP must come to the Yellow Springs Campus for pre-admission conferences. These consist of: (a) an

evaluation session with an advisor from the Center for Experiential Education, (b) conferences with faculty members who will be evaluating demonstrated learning, (c) a planning conference with the faculty member who will be the applicant's academic advisor, and (d) an admission-decision conference.

5. Evaluation and Crediting of Work Experience. In almost every case the CEE faculty member has found that the applicants had completed at least the two years work experience required for an Antioch-Yellow Springs degree and had learned much about themselves and the working world in the process. The CEE advisors also try to help the applicants integrate their previous work experience into academic planning. The CEE advisor participates in the final conference with the academic advisor, the ADCP director, and the student, and occasionally suggests further ways of coordinating the student's academic program with specific jobs felt to be relevant to the program.

6. Demonstrated Learning Evaluation. In preparation for these evaluation conferences, applicants have completed forms for each course and these, plus other necessary information, have been forwarded to the faculty member who will be evaluating the applicant's knowledge. These interviews can take up to 20 hours of consultation, depending on the amount of credit petitioned and the number of faculty involved. In cases of extensive demonstrated learning, the evaluation conferences can extend over a two or three day period of time.

There are three possible outcomes to these conferences. First, credit is granted, either for the course or courses that the student has listed, for a similar course or courses, or for a course or courses representing a modification of the original request. In the second instance, credit is granted provisionally, i.e., the student is required to submit additional material, either a paper, some further documentation, some portfolio, or other evidence. This credit is

not entered on the program agreement, but noted as credit to be entered upon completion of specified material. (The demonstrated learning credit is entered on the program agreement as transfer credit, and counts as part of the 160 credits needed for graduation; it cannot count as part of the minimum of 50 credits which must be taken with the Yellow Springs faculty after admission to the ADCP.) The third possibility is simply the non-granting of credit.

7. Planning Session with the Academic Advisor. During this session the student and the advisor review the past academic experiences including both transfer credit and demonstrated learning credit. First they ensure that a combination of transfer and demonstrated learning credits with the actual courses to be taken in the ADCP will satisfy the general education distribution requirements which include 20 credits in each of the three areas: Humanities, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. It is possible, and frequently happens, that the demonstrated learning credits amount to a significant part of the student's general education requirements.

Subsequently the student and the advisor determine what portion of the 60 credit field (major) requirement has been completed. Here again appropriate demonstrated learning credits can be included. In the special case of nurses who have completed either a diploma or an Associate Degree in Nursing, and who have passed the state examinations required for the RN degree, the credited demonstrated learning often can satisfy all of the requirements for a major in Human Biology (see attached document to "Graduates of the Miami Valley Hospital School of Nursing").

The remainder of the advising session is devoted to establishing a study plan which will allow the student both to meet his/her adult responsibilities and to complete the degree requirements at a pace which allows genuine learning

to occur. In some instances, even when demonstrated learning credit is not needed because of the amount of transfer credit presented, students are encouraged to petition for demonstrated learning credit becuase the CEE advisor, the academic advisor, or the admissions committee discover that the students have considerably more knowledge than they had realized, and that credit for such achievement legitimately should be part of the student's academic record. In such cases arrangements are made for demonstrated learning evaluations to occur during the course of the student's study. However, every effort is made to see that all needed demonstrated learning crediting be completed before entrance into the program. This allows the students and their advisors to have as clear an idea as possible of the remaining degree requirements to plan the manner in which they can be met (see attached document, ADCP Form 6, "Degree Program Agreements").

8. Actual Study. Here we will again limit ourselves to that part of the program which most concerns the evaluation of previous learning. In many instances the education carried on through the program relates to the education already accomplished prior to admissions. Antioch-Yellow Springs has always been committed to the idea that the classroom is not the only place where learning can take place. Therefore, for many adult students, the process of independent study which may have resulted in a considerable amount of demonstrated learning credits continues after admissions, but with the difference that the process is carried out under direct faculty sponsorship. In some instances the same job in which the student had learned academically creditable material serves as a laboratory or workshop for more advanced study. Thus the student who works as a volunteer in a prison rehabilitation program, and who had received academic credit in social work for the knowledge gained through this

experience, can continue to use the program as a basis for an advanced senior project in social work. Students who have worked for years as teacher's associates and who have received credit in education for knowledge thus gained, subject to the approval of the Education Department in each individual case, can earn credit for continuing in the same position, but under college supervision, so they can meet their student teaching requirements.

III. FACULTY WORKSHOPS ON EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATED LEARNING

The necessity for evaluating non-classroom achieved academic learning caused the ADCP Committee to realize the importance of maintaining the same standards of faculty expertise in judgment that already operated in the College. In order to ensure this, they decided that all evaluation of academic learning, rather than being done administratively, must be undertaken by those Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty members who teach in the disciplines related to the field to be evaluated. In order for the faculty to understand the special problems involved in the evaluation of adults, the Committee saw the need for a series of training workshops in which the faculty already involved in the program would share their experiences, discuss ways of improving their evaluation techniques, and facilitate the future evaluative activities of their colleagues.

In November 1974, approximately 25 of the faculty members and administrators involved in the program met for two full-day workshops to discuss the evaluation of demonstrated learning. The following sections pertain to that meeting. They include: (A) a brief statement to the faculty about the nature of the workshops, (B) an agenda for the meeting (based on the response to questionnaires sent in advance to faculty pertaining to the questions and issues which the faculty themselves felt most important to be discussed), (C) a summary of the workshops. While parts of the information given to the faculty may repeat some material presented above, the entire document may be useful to faculty and students of other institutions planning a new program for adults.

A. Antioch-Yellow Springs Fall Workshops: Statement to Faculty Participating in the Assessment of Demonstrated Learning of ADCP Students

1. Background. These workshops are funded as part of the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning (CAEL) Project. The Antioch-Yellow Springs project will involve those members of the Yellow Springs faculty who have been active in the evaluation of non-classroom experiences of students entering the Adult Degree Completion Program. The project as it is funded will consist of the following stages:

a. Preliminary preparation and general evaluation of particular aspects of demonstrated learning prior to the Fall workshops.

b. Two weekend workshops involving the Yellow Springs faculty participating in the demonstrated learning evaluations, other Yellow Springs faculty and administrators, and possibly outside experts.

c. A series of case studies prepared by the faculty to illustrate and document the assessment of demonstrated learning.

d. The preparation and publication of a kit or handbook on the techniques used by the Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty in the evaluation of demonstrated learning of students in the ADCP.

2. General Definition and Explanation of Demonstrated Learning and Its Relationship to the Adult Degree Completion Program. The Antioch-Yellow Springs Adult Degree Completion Program as it was designed in the Fall of 1973-74, and as it has been implemented in the Spring and Summer of this current year, played a significant role in the types of creditable experiences anticipated among the prospective students. It must be noted that the accumulation of such experiences was not considered a requirement; many of the students entered the program as ordinary "transfers," transferring credits from other

institutions, which the Antioch College registrar accepts according to the currently established guidelines for crediting. Other students entering the program presented a combination of regularly earned transfer credits and demonstrated learning credits.

For those students asking for either partial or total crediting by demonstrated learning, the standard explanation offered was that the student may well have earned either through private study, through work experience, through attendance of classes outside the accreditation boundaries established by college registrars, or by other means, knowledge the equivalent of college classroom knowledge. Often we explain demonstrated learning as "the kind of material that would correspond to a college course if you had taken the course in a regular college." As a guide we frequently suggest that the prospective student consult not only our own course listings and catalog, but also the catalogs of other colleges, technical schools, or universities, and find tentative titles for the petitioned courses. The student is asked to fill out a form for each proposed course, with the understanding that, should he/she progress far enough in the application process to come for the pre-admission conferences, his/her claim to these credits would be evaluated in a meeting with the Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty or department in the particular discipline.

Thus housewives who have been active in community or political organizations and who have submitted demonstrated learning petitions in the field of political science are interviewed and assessed by members of the Political Science Department. Businessmen and women who have claimed knowledge in accounting or personnel management acquired through their own experiences have been examined by the Administration Department. Students claiming knowledge of social work as a result of their volunteer work in the community or in prison reform work have

been evaluated by the Social Work Department. The results of these interviews have varied considerably. In some instances credit was given as petitioned. In others it was given contingent upon the submission of additional background material. In some instances it was denied on the basis of insufficient knowledge and experience.

In setting up the program and in explaining to the Yellow Springs faculty the mechanisms for crediting demonstrated learning, the ADCP Committee established the guideline that all crediting must be done by the Yellow Springs faculty qualified in the particular discipline. Thus the administration of the ADCP does not accept crediting by outside experts beyond the transfer of credits from accredited institutions. The only exceptions arise when the subject petitioned falls outside the expertise of the Yellow Springs faculty. In that case outside experts are called in, after consultation with appropriate Yellow Springs faculty. It is therefore appropriate that after the initial experience of admitting 44 students as of the beginning of Fall quarter 1974, those Yellow Springs faculty who have been most active in the evaluation of demonstrated learning come together to share their experiences, discuss ways of further exploration of assessment techniques, and point the way to usable communication of this experience.

B. Agenda for the ADCP/CAEL Workshops on Demonstrated Learning; November 16, 1974

I. Introduction and description of the CAEL Project.

II. Demonstrated learning in the ADCP; a survey of what's been done.

III. Reading of questions; identification and listing of additional questions and topics submitted by the faculty for discussion.

IV. Other approaches to crediting. Descriptions of academic crediting and experiential crediting.

V. Work groups meet on specific questions:

Group 1: Validity and proportion of independent study.

Group 2: Kinds of creditable experiences.

Group 3: Methods of evaluation.

Group 4: Transcription of non-sponsored learning.

Group 5: Quality/Quantity.

VI. Groups report to general discussion.

As the purpose of these workshops is to allow the faculty to discuss and evaluate their experiences, no formal presentations have been called for. The larger areas in the afternoon sessions represent proposed formats for discussion of these questions. Obviously the topics listed can't be completed during the first workshop. Next week's format will thus be based on what we have and haven't discussed today.

Following is a list of questions and concerns submitted by faculty members. Remember that the first part of today's session will be devoted to augmenting this list.

1. What kinds of experiences are creditable, and what are not? (Cosmetics, psychotherapy, driving school, typing, childbirth, etc.)
2. Is a series of independent studies sufficient toward an Antioch degree?
3. Does the informal discussion technique with candidates lead to evaluations based on personality rather than real competence?
4. What methods have been used in the evaluation of demonstrated learning and what should be used in the future?
5. Can we devise written scales for evaluation?
6. Can we ask candidates for written work, possibly as part of a file?
7. What personality quality are we looking for, and to what extent does this figure into the crediting, or should it?
8. How recent should the experience be in relation to evaluation?

9. Can we set standards for the kinds and amounts of information that ADCP candidates bring to the evaluation conferences?

10. Could we incorporate some measure of quality in our forms? Evaluations, grades?

11. How much should we use CLEP, or other standard tests?

12. How do we credit course work from non-accredited institutions?

13. Previous Antioch course work?

14. How can we serve, credit, and evaluate a candidate with other interests, background, etc., than described in our curriculum?

15. Should we use other methods for older students?

16. Can we credit, or should we credit, for any previous experience?

17. Is the balance in content for older students different than for regular students? How should this affect the amount and kind of previous non-classroom credit?

18. What standards should be set for the kinds and amounts of demonstrated learning credits?

19. When is it sufficient that a skill has been developed? Should there be elements of theory, facts, and depth of understanding? How much, and how is this determined?

20. Do our standards for evaluation of general education credit for demonstrated learning differ from those for field credit?

21. What documentation should be provided both in descriptive and evaluative aspects?

22. Is there a point at which this becomes an excessive burden of red tape type activity which will discourage a desirable candidate?

23. Can we accept an account of past performance at face value without compromising the process?

24. How do we establish comparability of standards being set between individuals, departments, areas?

C. Summary of the Fall Workshops

It was never the purpose either of the administrative staff of the ADCP or

of the faculty themselves, to use the workshops to arrive at some formalized guidelines which could then be followed during the future evaluations of demonstrated learning. Indeed the general consensus among the faculty and staff was that the procedures already in operation, namely that faculty members would do the evaluations on the same basis of individual freedom with which they carry out evaluations in the regular program, would continue in the ADCP. However it seemed extremely advantageous to have workshops in which the faculty might locate and identify certain problems, might consult and advise each other on the process of evaluation, and might individually, if not collectively, find new ways of solving commonly expressed problems.

Therefore, in presenting the results of the workshops, the method used was the rather informal one of listing concerns, questions, and solutions to problems in the order in which they occurred. The listing of topics comes from the chronological and, in some instances, verbatim report of the workshops themselves. In selecting the topics, the principle that they be of general interest and usefulness to Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty members as well as to other colleagues involved in similar endeavors was preserved. It should be noted that the ADCP Committee felt that frequently the presentation of a problem without any specified solution is valuable. The nature of adult degree programs can be expected to engender certain repetitions of general problems. Individual solutions should be left to groups working within particular environments, with their own special academic traditions, faculties, kinds of students, administrators, etc.

Here, then, is a summary of the main topics that were discussed during the two-day workshops. As can be expected, the workshops did not address themselves to all of the questions which its participants had agendized.

1. The question was raised about variations in institutional standards of crediting; this involved certain assumptions which may be particular to the Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty. Specifically, do we grant credit for rote learning? The case was raised of a student who had memorized a certain series of codes or laws, i.e., the Ohio Vehicle Code, sections of criminal codes, etc. Would rote learning be acceptable as credit to a teacher who normally doesn't give such credit? This lead to further discussions about the relative weight in evaluations of rote learning and skills, versus conceptualization. No collective consensus was reached, but a certain skepticism about "substandard" learning was expressed.

2. Several faculty members presented the view that any correct evaluation of a student's past learning can be carried out only in terms of the goals of the experience in which that learning took place and in terms of the student's long-range educational goals. They felt, therefore, that part of the evaluation process should include some clear statement from the students about their goals. This might come in the form of a paper related to a particular project, or a general paper. It was pointed out that part of the admissions process includes a personal statement from the students about their reasons for reentering college, etc. However, those who proposed the statement of goals wanted something more specifically related to the courses for which credit was being petitioned.

In opposition to this suggestion was the idea that by demanding such a statement of goals we might both be expecting the adult undergraduate student to perform in a more advanced way than our usual undergraduates who are not required to present statements of goals in order to receive credit, and that we would, in fact, be requiring our students to reach degrees of maturity and self-expression at an early period in their degree program which are more properly expected near

its completion.

3. Several faculty members felt it necessary for a student to present a portfolio or a narrative and documented transcript for the acquisition of credit. It was the general consensus of the group that, while no institutional policy on the amount or kinds of physical documentation was necessary, certain subjects would dictate at least a minimum of such material. The faculty of the Art Department were unanimous in their request for physical evidence of prior learning previous to any evaluation conferences with applicants. Other faculty suggested the use of catalogs and course descriptions when applicants wished to demonstrate knowledge achieved in non-accredited institutions. This is, in fact, program policy. When an applicant has received credit or graduated from a non-accredited college or a non-academic institution, the faculty member doing the evaluation is presented with not only the transcript from the institution, but also a catalog, course descriptions, or any other material pertinent to what the applicant studied.

4. Some concern was raised about the issue of faculty contact, both for the evaluation of demonstrated learning, and for independent study, especially with students who would be doing the majority of their work off campus. In this respect certain departmental policies were mentioned; in some instances independent study is permitted only after the successful completion of a course in the department. But for the most part faculty members felt that in spite of the difficulties of assessment and documentation, a faculty member reasonably could be expected, after a session or sessions with applicants, to give a fairly accurate assessment of students' claims of having knowledge in the given field. Further, the program's philosophy that the important element in learning is the fact that it did take place, not the manner or the place in which this

happened, outweighed the concern about faculty contact. However, the need for greater overall faculty contact and supervision with students whose main educational vehicle is independent study continues to be of concern to the faculty working with the program. We are exploring the use of faculty committees, rather than individuals, working more closely with students during the progress of their degree work. Such use of committees might also be extended to evaluating the demonstrated learning of students with whom the ADCP staff feels that sufficient contact could not be established.

5. Among the concerns raised by the faculty was the problem of honesty. Faculty members found themselves frequently in the situation of having to believe (or not believe) that students in fact knew what they claimed to know. The solution suggested was that the faculty member make use in such cases of requests for additional evidence, in the form of a paper, project, or other documentation before decisions about awarding credit can be made. This gives students additional time to produce evidence of their knowledge, and provides the faculty a more reasonable check on the quality and quantity of previous learning.

6. Several faculty expressed concern about the pressure of time in the demonstrated learning evaluations. One faculty member frankly felt himself under tremendous pressure to grant credit since the student was standing there waiting for a decision. It was suggested that two interviews rather than one might relieve the teacher/evaluator of the pressure of making a spot decision. In fact, as a result of the expression of this concern, the direction of the program, whenever possible, has had informal preliminary conferences with students, frequently involving the faculty members in whose field potential demonstrated learning credit might be awarded. One recent example is of a student

whose field was traffic engineering, who came to campus for an informal interview with the program director and the professor of Engineering and Communications to discuss and identify the possible listings of demonstrated learning courses. In other cases when students are unable to come to campus before the actual pre-admission conferences, the director frequently brings to the attention of the appropriate department the file of the student, including descriptions of jobs, personal references, documentation in the form of written performances, etc. The actual selection of a faculty evaluator, the course titles and levels and, frequently, additional requests for information and preparation for the interviews, are then the result of considerable previous consultation.

Another department reported that they solve the problem of pressure of the interview by always having at least two, and frequently three, members of the department present at any evaluation session. In this context, the group discussed the concept of extending the process of evaluations to include students on the evaluation committee. This proposition brought about a considerable amount of support and opposition. In theory, the group decided to leave it alone. In practice, the use of committees in evaluations remains at the discretion of the individual faculty member or department. In at least one instance, an ADCP student has been used as a consultant in the preparation of the demonstrated learning evaluations of another student for most practical reasons. This student, who is a sergeant in the State Highway Patrol, was the person most capable of reading and interpreting the work experience and the potential academic learning areas that were documented by an applicant who is chief of detectives in a county sheriff's office.

7. It was the general consensus of the group, especially after several

discussions of alternative types of evaluations through competency based criteria etc., that the most unique feature of the Antioch-Yellow Springs ADCP, in comparison with other programs, was the use of the full-time liberal arts faculty, not only in undertaking the evaluations of previous learning, but in the entire instruction of ADCP students. Over and over the faculty maintained that the program's strongest feature was its ability to combine the standards of the liberal arts college with the flexibility of searching for, identifying, evaluating, and crediting past knowledge, regardless of how it was achieved.

8. One faculty group raised questions regarding creditable kinds of learning and spent considerable time with the problem of the dichotomy between practical and academic experience. The group felt that exact dividing lines were impossible to draw. Nevertheless they felt that upholding a specific distinction was important, namely that in dealing with college credit a certain emphasis must be placed not only on the accumulation of skills and experiences, but on some ability to conceptualize and generalize about this experience. The group found quite satisfactory the option chosen many times by faculty members of requesting a student to either do additional readings about a subject in which the student had had considerable practical experience, or of presenting a paper in which this experience, or at least some aspect of it, is synthesized, generalized, or conceptualized.

One of the themes which was to be repeated over and over again came from this group, namely that, "Experience itself is not credited, but the learning derived from such experience may be credited. The applicants, therefore, must demonstrate that they have derived from their experiences some knowledge which is systematic and conceptual, that goes beyond the particular to encompass general principles applicable in diverse situations."

9. One of the most persistent problems seemed to be the matter of communication. It was felt that since Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty and staff are so familiar with educational terminology, they might very well make the incorrect assumption that the potential students will understand their explanations concerning demonstrated learning. The staff reported that this indeed was a serious problem. Regardless of how many times the concept of demonstrated learning was explained, and regardless of frequent sample lists made up for the applicants, they often were bewildered at the prospect of having, themselves, to prepare lists of potentially creditable courses. The small discussion groups, and later the larger faculty group, identified several possible methods of alleviating this problem. One would be the preparation, when deemed appropriate, of a catalog of demonstrated learning courses. This would give prospective students concrete examples of demonstrated learnings. One objection to this process was based on a fear of limitation of options; namely that to whatever degree it opens up possibilities, to another it limits. The evaluation of any one student may very well be irrelevant to another, no matter how great the apparent similarities in their dossiers. But since one of the outcomes of the project is to be a catalog of demonstrated learning, certainly a prime question will be whether the students and faculty find that such listings indeed help or hinder the further evaluations. Another suggestion to be implemented is an individual or departmental statement of general requirements for demonstrated learning. The Art Department has already established such a policy; namely that in most instances they require a portfolio-type documentation of prior learning before the interview, and that they conduct the crediting evaluations as a committee rather than individually.

Another suggestion was to provide students with examples of previous evalu-

ations to serve as guides. Since such examples are part of this present study, it was suggested that this document, intended primarily as a guide for faculty both of Antioch-Yellow Springs and of other institutions, might serve in a modified form as a guide to potential ADCP students as well. Short of that, the incorporation of some of its contents into a similar guidebook, but one prepared especially for prospective students, was suggested and is under serious consideration by the staff and faculty of the ADCP.

10. One of the faculty expressed concern at not really having available a total picture of the candidate's background, but only the material pertinent to the particular evaluation. He suggested that the demonstrated learning evaluators be able to examine the candidate's file before the interviews. Since the workshops, the ADCP staff has usually shared with the evaluators much more of the material from the file than is pertinent to the particular subject. The repeated concern of the faculty for more information about the prospective student suggests that these files might need to contain more information, and that the previously stated concern, namely that more statements about the student's goals were necessary in order for the faculty to carry out the evaluations, were indeed valid.

11. It was the concern of several participants that whenever possible two conferences be part of the demonstrated learning evaluation process; the first would be a chance for the faculty member to get acquainted with the prospective student, to ask the kinds of questions that might both serve to help the prospective student provide the necessary information for the demonstrated learning already requested and also help identify other possible areas of academic learning. The ADCP staff concurred and has tried to carry this out whenever feasible. The staff also realized that such a process might be

advantageous to potential students living in the area, but not so to students living so far that they could only come to the campus for one pre-admission conference. Again, partially as a compromise, the suggestion was made to create some kind of central coordinating committee that would examine the folders of prospective students, especially those of students for whom distance made more than one pre-admission visit to the Yellow Springs campus impossible. The ADCP Committee is planning to explore the possibility of such a suggestion. It must be noted, however, that such an increase of faculty and administrative time would increase the bureaucratic apparatus of the program, create more work, and possibly more resistance on the part of the faculty, and could depersonalize the relationships between the students and their academic advisors. Other institutions faced with similar problems would have to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the use of committees as screening boards for prospective students before their actual arrival on campus.

12. Some questions were raised about the usefulness of examinations. The problem was whether we are supposed to credit present levels of knowledge or prior learning. An examination might just test present levels. This would in a sense be harder on entering adult students than on transfer students from accredited colleges and universities who are not required to demonstrate current knowledge, but rather to provide certification that the learning and knowledge did in fact take place.

13. Some concern was expressed regarding the verification of previous knowledge. Is a transcript plus the usual letters of recommendation sufficient? Faculty members felt that in searching for additional information one could run into the trap of then having to take the word not of the student, but of the remote evaluators. The general consensus was that faculty members would

have to rely on their own current assessment of the student's capacities.

14. Considerable concern and disagreement were expressed about the possible remedies for the lack of contact, not only during the evaluations of prior learning, but also during the actual education at Antioch-Yellow Springs itself. One of the proposed solutions caused considerable debate. It was the idea that students would be required to spend some specified time on campus, as a group, not only sharing their current learning either in special courses, or at least in ADCP seminars, but also discussing their motivations. It was noted that such requirements are featured in similar adult programs (Goddard). At present the technical problems of such a requirement seem to outweigh the possible advantages, but it was suggested that as the program grows, it might be possible to identify certain courses which a large group of adult students would want to take, as well as specific times at which a large enough number of students would be available to make this feasible.

IV. CASE STUDIES

Frequently manuals about nontraditional education, especially when concerned about assessment techniques, tend to place too much emphasis on theory at the expense of practice. The present document is not immune to such a danger. Therefore, the staff of the project felt it best to balance the first part of the report with actual case studies and articles about specific practices on the Yellow Springs Campus. This will be followed by some sample demonstrated learning evaluation reports and samples of the actual forms used for documentation by the Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty. Two types of forms are presented: those in which credit is given immediately after the interview, and those in which some additional work is required before the granting of credit. Such material documentation might be of the most use not only to faculty members at Antioch-Yellow Springs who are participating in the process of evaluating demonstrated learning for the first time, but also to educators from other institutions involved in similar programs and processes. At least one program administrator, having attended a long conference on educational assessment, was heard to say that he learned more from private discussions with individual teachers outside the conference room on what they actually did, than in the meetings where the same teachers often gave lengthy reports on what they felt they should do. Here, then, are some examples of how demonstrated learning evaluations have actually worked on the Yellow Springs Campus during the first five quarters of the operation of the Adult Degree Completion Program.

Case Study I

L.W. is a mature woman who entered the ADCP with a background of attendance at three universities, and work experience of some ten years followed by ten

years of being at home as a housewife and mother. She then returned to the work force as a personnel counselor and for the six years prior to admittance to the program had been a teacher's aide in an urban middle school.

Before I saw her, L.W. had decided that she wished to pursue a career as a secondary school teacher and had prepared a number of applications for demonstrated academic learning credits based on her experiences in the community as a volunteer and on her work as a teacher's aide. Among the submitted applications were three requesting credit for: "Role of Volunteerism in Schools, or Managing a School Volunteer Program;" "The Community School Concept;" and "Career Education." Supporting these requests were written descriptions of the role played by L.W. as a volunteer coordinator for six schools, listing 28 activities engaged in, which ranged from instructing the volunteer in the use of flash cards to counseling with the volunteer who was unhappy in her assignment; a description of her involvement in a "community" school both as a community member and as a worker in the school; and a description of her involvement in planning and holding a "career week" involving students, teachers, administrators, and the business community.

At my suggestion these three requests were combined into a single application for demonstrated academic learning credits for Introduction to Education (5 credits). This course is required for admission into the Education Department, and its major purpose is to develop an understanding of the public school in American society. Its contents include historical, political, and economic analysis of schools as they exist today; and current issues are used to focus these topics.

In discussing with L.W. the activities carried out in the course of her involvement in the programs and activities, it was quite clear that in addition

to the listing of activities and the analyses she had presented in her writing, L.W. had a significant and sophisticated grasp of the organization, structure, and operations of her school and its place in the system; that she had read considerable amounts of the literature of the subject; and that the level of information and understanding was more advanced that I expect most of my students to achieve in this course.

We spent about an hour and a half arriving at the determination of how to credit this material and substantiating the crediting beyond the level of the written material. However, this time spent also contributed to decisions about further credits to be applied for and beginning to plan her program.

Case Study II

In what follows I will briefly describe my experience as an evaluator working with one candidate for the ADCP, and then close with a description of the guidelines that I use for the evaluation process. Since my fields of competency are computer science, data processing, and theoretical chemistry, my remarks apply specifically to these disciplines, but hopefully might be of use to others involved in this process in different fields.

Candidate's Background. The candidate was a middle-aged, caucasian male, who had had approximately ten years work experience as a supervisor of data processing personnel and had middle management responsibility for several projects that involved design and installation of both manual and computerized systems in a business environment.

Pre-Evaluation Contact with the Candidate. Prior to the evaluation interview, I spoke to the candidate on the phone, so that I might obtain a better idea of the specifics of his background, make suggestions to him regarding his

preparation for the evaluation, and in general to let him know what my expectations were in the context of accreditation of demonstrated learning.

During this conversation, which lasted approximately 20 minutes, I learned that he had been involved with the writing of procedures manuals, specifying control operations, task scheduling (including time/cost analysis), designing and flow charting an accounting system, doing comparative systems analysis, and supervising system conversions. Upon obtaining this specific information, I suggested that we consider evaluating two five-credit blocks--one corresponding to an existing course in our curriculum, PS 254, Computer Organization and Data Processing, and the other, an intermediate level independent study in Systems Analysis. I then gave him a brief description of the two courses and asked him to prepare drafts of ADCP form 3-A (see page 64) including appropriate knowledge and skills for each of these courses. Finally, I informed him that I would evaluate him via an informal oral exam and asked him to bring to the evaluation session any exhibits documenting the above activities.

Evaluation Session. This session lasted one hour and consisted of the candidate giving detailed descriptions of his work experience and of the skills and knowledges that he had obtained in order to perform his job. I attempted to explain how our curriculum attempted to organize these kinds of data processing knowledges into a conceptual and in some cases theoretical framework. In the course of our discussion, it became quite apparent to me that he had exceeded my expectations of competency for the two courses that we were evaluating. I informed him of this, drafted my evaluation for Form 3-A, and invited him to apply for additional demonstrated learning credits in the field of computer science (an invitation he chose not to pick up).

Evaluation Guidelines. (A) A preliminary discussion with the candidate prior to the evaluation session is extremely desirable, if not downright necessary. During this discussion (which can conveniently be conducted over the telephone) the groundwork for an effective evaluation interview is laid. The evaluator and candidate exchange social amenities, their expectations of the evaluation are discussed, and agreements are reached as to the form and method of the evaluation.

(B) As much as possible, I find it useful to attempt to "map" the candidate's previous learning into our existing curriculum. This has several advantages: (1) simplicity; (2) it produces a "better" looking transcript for the candidate; (3) it allows me to easily suggest or require readings to help the candidate develop a conceptual framework within which to organize his/her somewhat fragmented skills and knowledges; and (4) it facilitates "placing" the candidate in the regular student body and curriculum so that I can give practical feedback as to the candidate's status (including verbal grading of work, recommended further study, and most importantly, encouragement to help the candidate view him- or herself as a legitimate student, since it has been my experience that such candidates tend to vastly underrate their previous learning).

Case Study III

Description of the Person and the Source of his Experience. T.W. is an Ohio State Patrolman. He has been a policeman since 1958. In his job as a sergeant, he is responsible for supervising several other patrolmen. I believe he currently supervises 20 men. T.W. is a confident, self-assured individual. In talking with him I was impressed with his ability to communicate clearly and concisely. T.W. seems to have a good deal of ability as far as crystalizing

his experience into generally applicable concepts. He has a practitioner's understanding of management theory.

The Kinds of Questions Asked During the Interview. I nearly always start the interview with a general question. In this case, T.W. was attempting to get credit (demonstrated learning) in a course I teach called "Management of Human Resources." So, I started the interview with "Well, T., tell me what you know about management of human resources. That is, tell me why I should award you credit for this course." I will not, in this summary, detail all of T.'s answers to my questions because of space considerations but, for this question, I will give a summary of T.'s answer so that the reader may have an idea of the kind of answers I receive from participants in this program. T. talked about an incentive program for his dispatchers and patrolmen that he developed. The program has significantly improved patrolman involvement in the stolen car program and productivity (number of stolen cards found). The program has since been implemented on a statewide basis. In the process of this answer, T. evidenced an understanding of positive reinforcement and its relationship to morale. The program involved no outlay of departmental funds, so, I now asked T.: "What are the motivating factors in the program?" T.'s answer indicated an understanding of two major theories of motivation, Maslow's needs hierarchy and Herzberg's two factor theory of motivation. I now asked T.: "What is the managerial task? What do managers do?" T.'s answer showed me that he had an understanding of the managerial task with a very good understanding of leadership theory, that is, he evidenced understanding of McGregor's Theories X and Y and he also manifested an understanding of Tannenbaum and Schmidt's leadership continuum. I then asked T.: "What should a manager do with an employee that is performing poorly?" T.'s answer showed a good understanding of the counseling

mode of dealing with employees as well as a good understanding of McGregor's concept of "professional help." At this point, after all the name dropping that I have done, it is necessary to note that T. did not know these theorists by name. The important thing from my vantage point is that he understood the substance of their theories. I asked T. how he went about recruitment and selection. T. gave me a satisfactory answer. I asked T. what he thought the primary problems of personnel administration were. He responded with the idea that beyond what we had already discussed, he saw performance appraisal and communications in organizations as primary problems. I asked, "What is the problem as far as performance appraisal is concerned?" He responded that it was a problem as far as method (how does one conduct a performance appraisal interview without raising the defenses of the employee?) and tactics (what, if any, appraisal instruments are valid and reliable?)

The Criteria Used for Evaluation. In this case, the criteria I used for evaluation were essentially the same criteria I use for any student in this course. Specifically, does he have an adequate grasp of the concepts, theories, and methods discussed in this course? My evaluation of T. was that he had an obvious grasp of the concepts of the course. I had no trouble in awarding him credit for this course. In fact, I considered having him come to the class as a guest lecturer to discuss how he uses the ideas that are talked about in the course of his work.

The Length of the Interview. This interview took approximately one hour. It could have been shorter, if T. had put a good deal of the information on paper before coming to the interview. I typically don't expect that to happen though, since the applicant rarely has a good sense of what I am looking for before the interview. I like it that way. I would rather have the interview

be free flowing than just a monologue by the student of a memorized text.

The Quality of the Work and the General Level of Competency as Compared to Regular Undergraduates. T.'s competency in this area is superior to that of most regular undergraduate students. I believe it would be very difficult for a regular student to match the competency that T. has gained through approximately 15 years in the field as a manager. I chose T. for this case study because I look at him as an example of the type of person that ADCP can best serve. It is not a good program for someone who is looking for "the easy way out." It is a great program for someone, like T., who has some college and has spent a good amount of time in private, independent study.

Case Study IV

The following case study attempts to relate the demonstrated learning of a particular subject to the student's total program in the ADCP. The faculty evaluator was also the student's academic advisor.

D.W. is a good example of a mature student who has returned to college under the ADCP, and has used the Program very well. D. built upon his job experience and furthered his own special interests in the area of Environmental Studies; he also contributed appreciably to an improvement in the academic classroom situation through his interest and his participation in discussions.

D. and I met several times to evaluate his petition for demonstrated learning and also to see how his previous job experience and academic work fit in with his present goals, i.e. as a major in Environmental Studies with some emphasis on biology. D. had worked for several months for an established tree surgeon company and then bought his own tools, saws, pulleys, and other equipment to set himself up in business. He practiced on his own for several months and continued

the same enterprise here in Yellow Springs after his return to college. In our interview D. mentioned that he knew his trees quite well, how to care for them and some of the theory of plant growth and development. He also said that he was confident in his job and successful enough to support himself.

We conferred on the ways in which we might evaluate his learning and agreed that we could best find out if he would demonstrate his methods to a class in Environmental Botany and discuss the theories of plant growth as related to pruning techniques. D. did this evaluation step very well and contributed to this and other discussions in the class. D.'s work in Environmental Botany was really very good, nearly at the top of a class of 28 students. He was aided in his studies by his previous job experience which seemed to provide both motivation and energy to study effectively.

The other demonstrated learning units D. was seeking credit for were Boat Carpentry and Auto Mechanics; these were evaluated by another faculty member in the Engineering Department.

Since D.'s major was in Environmental Studies, I became his faculty academic advisor. In this context, we discussed his background and his objectives in returning to college. D.'s background in science included courses in general biology, field botany, ornithology, physical geology, and beginning chemistry. We agreed that he needed another chemistry course, at least, and also environmental botany and terrestrial environments. Recommended were courses in physics, mathematics, geology, vertebrate zoology, as well as several in social sciences, i.e. economics, business administration, sociology, and psychology. The choice of courses was arrived at to support this interest in working in environment-related problems and in his tree surgeon business. D. expressed the desire not to go to graduate school; at least he did not want to consider it

at this time. I advised him, if he changed his mind, that organic chemistry and calculus should definitely be included among his courses.

While it is difficult to assess job experience in terms of regular academic course work, I believe that D.'s work experience in the tree business was a good basis for his effective study on campus. He filled in the areas he was deficient in by subsequent course work. In this sense, it is unwise to treat learning as segmented blocks; a person does not separate knowledge into useful practice and fundamental theory; rather, theory and practice make a whole. In this view, D.'s use of the ADCP opportunities has been very good. He used his job-derived maturity to good advantage in his course work. Moreover, he was a good example to his peers in terms of his sense of purpose and his sense of responsibility. In the process, D. raised his own level of expectation, as well as his ability and confidence to fulfill that expectation.

Case Study V

Student A. This ADCP candidate asked to be evaluated for learning Kundalini Yoga. I knew almost nothing about it, but had acted as a supervising instructor for a student who was at that time teaching such a course. I asked him to sit in with me. My evaluation process went through four steps:

1. I asked her to tell me what Kundalini Yoga is, after admitting that I knew almost nothing about it. For about 10 or 15 minutes I followed every statement of hers with another question, about history, concept, practice, gratification, comparison with other things I knew something about. At the outset I made it clear that I was the student, she was the teacher, and that she needed to educate me as fully as she could in a very short time.

2. I turned to the student teacher of Kundalini Yoga, and asked him how

his experiences compared to hers. I dropped out of the conversation and became an observer while he and she compared notes on positions, breathing, gurus, texts, joys, and difficulties.

3. After about 15 minutes of that conversation, I shifted to a completely quantitative inquiry: how many hours a week, how many weeks did she invest in Kundalini Yoga? Then I asked the student teacher to help me compare her investment in time to the investment of time he requires of students for five credits (full quarter course). As I recall, it was about three/fifths or four/fifths of what he expects from his students.

4. I then turned back to the qualitative question. I made a statement about how well I thought she had been able to use the 10 or 15 minutes to educate me on the subject, and what I thought this suggested about her mastery of fundamental concepts. I also told her what I observed about her competency in the subject as revealed by her dialogue with the student teacher. I then asked the student teacher to give his appraisal of what she had learned, as revealed in his dialogue with her, and to appraise my judgment of her mastery of fundamental concepts. His view was that I over-evaluated her learning, because she had learned concepts more and better than techniques, and Kundalini Yoga is more technique than concept. I then asked her to appraise my evaluation and the student teacher's. Then we had a three-way conversation about how what we had learned about her learning could be translated into Antioch-Yellow Springs' credit system. The final figure was an easily negotiated one credit.

Student B. This ADCP candidate, who is a state highway patrolman, claimed to have nearly complete mastery of the Ohio Motor Vehicle Code: "I know most of the sections by heart and by number. I simply took the Code, called off eighten section numbers and asked him to identify their content and recite a

portion. Then I reversed the procedure: I gave him a quote or a summary of a section and asked him to identify the section number. He was at least 75 percent accurate in both directions. The process lasted about 10-15 minutes and yielded a note on a list of about 50 intellectual accomplishments he'd drawn up that yes, in this case, he certainly could do what he claimed he could do.

Case Study VI

J.G. is a vivacious alert woman who does not appear to be in the late forties that she must be. Except for one year of college, she has spent the years since high school in the manner that so many of her age mates have, rearing children, doing part-time work, and working very hard as a community volunteer. When her two daughters were of school age, she became secretary to the assistant superintendent of the Xenia City Schools. In that position she was given the responsibility for all the bookkeeping, including appropriation and general fund accounting and preparation of the monthly financial reports to the Board of Education. When her husband took a job in another city, she worked part-time at Antioch in the Office of Educational Research, at which time her interest in an Antioch education for herself was stimulated. It would be 14 years before she would be able to follow up on that initial interest.

In the meantime she became involved in the League of Women Voters. Over a nine-year period, she chaired League studies in vocational education, welfare, state and city finances, and alternatives to incarceration. For two years she served as president, a job which requires considerable skill in administration, program planning, and human relations.

Her experiences to this point provided her with a rich store of knowledge and

skills which she was able to utilize in many unique community experiences. One of these was a citizens-leader's group which studied the finances of Springfield, Ohio, developed a plan, and worked successfully for measures to increase the revenue of the city. Another was the Community Welfare Council where she became convinced of the need for professional staffing, wrote a proposal for funding a position, and when money was granted, chaired the personnel committee that filled the position. Still another was membership on a committee that made an unsuccessful attempt to work for the development of a master growth project for Springfield, Ohio and Clark County.

When she found herself with two daughters in college, she took a job as executive secretary of the Rotary Club's Crippled Children's Program. At this time she decided to apply for admission to the Antioch-Yellow Springs ADCP.

J. says her own middle-agedness and recent open heart surgery for her husband have made for a sense of urgency in her life. She wants a good educational experience, and because she is increasingly selective about how she uses her time and energies, she is not interested in sitting in dull classrooms collecting credit. She wants her formal education to be integrated with her life experience, and she does not expect to be viewed "as a little old lady who miraculously gets her degree in her waning years."

In order to make the best use of the knowledge gained over so many years of community work, J. chose a combination major in social work and political science. She had a total of 34 transfer credits and was able to demonstrate learning for an additional 103 credits, for a total of 137, leaving 50 to be earned--20 in the physical sciences and 20 in the major field.

Since her major involved social work, I became one of her advisors. In addition, I evaluated 25 of her demonstrated learning credits. It is these

that I propose now to discuss. Along with J.'s applications for the demonstrated learning I received her application materials which included an excellent autobiographical statement. In addition, I received a portfolio of speeches she had given, reports she had written or had had a large share in writing.

J.'s initial assessment of her achievements led her to apply for demonstrated academic credit in Sociology in the areas of (1) Public Assistance: Structure and Financing, (2) Social Welfare as an Institution, (3) Independent Field Experience: Community Welfare Council of Springfield and Clark County, (4) Independent Field Experience: Board Member of the Clark County Mental Health and Retardation Board, and (5) Alternatives to Incarceration. The Director of the ADCP perceived immediately and accurately that the subject matter described fell within the purview of courses already offered in the Social Work Program at Antioch-Yellow Springs.

I reviewed the applications for demonstrated academic learning. I suggested some changes in the way credit was being applied for. J.'s work in Public Assistance and what she called Social Welfare as an Institution more properly fit into our course called "Issues in Social Welfare," which deals in part with the realities of the impact of the public assistance system on families and with the realities of the public policy issues, particularly as public assistance relates to other social welfare systems. I examined her portfolio which included the 1965-67 League study and copies of relevant speeches she had made. In the conference she demonstrated an understanding that was equal to or superior to that of the outstanding students normally in the course. In that course we also cover housing and health. She was clear on the relationship of both to public assistance. More important is that she documented her

ability to be concerned and curious about social welfare issues as well as her ability to research the facts, to become involved, and to take effective action.

What J. called "Alternatives to Incarceration" fit well into our course on corrections. Her work in this area had started in 1973 when she began chairing a League of Women Voters study in alternatives to incarceration and rehabilitative services. The group reviewed detoxification centers, DWI schools, pretrial release, psychological services, probation, work study programs, parole, and halfway houses. They were concerned with the need for comprehensive planning, coordinating, monitoring and evaluating present and planned programs. From the portfolio and the conference she exhibited a knowledge and understanding that was superior to that of most of the regular undergraduates in the course. We made an informal agreement that she would give an oral presentation to the Corrections class.

Her field experience fell properly in the area of our Practicum I and Practicum II. As a Board member of the Community Welfare Council she capitalized on her knowledge of the community and the community agencies to write a grant proposal for professional staff for CWC. As chairperson for the personnel committee she was instrumental in hiring the person for whom funds became available. For her community work she was honored at the 1973 annual meeting of the CWC. Enrollees in the Practicum course must become proficient in some skills as well as in some knowledge areas. J. could demonstrate that she had become proficient in research, personnel, interviewing, group process, proposal writing, community organization. She could present in evidence speeches given before the annual meetings of CWC in 1970, 1972, and 1973.

Credit for Field Practicum II was given for her work on the Board of the

Mental Health and Retardation Board since November of 1971. On this Board she sits on the Finance Committee which has the responsibility for reviewing and recommending to the Board budget appropriations of one million dollars, a combination of state, local, and special grant monies. We asked her to submit for this course an agency description and a job analysis, which she did. From that and from the conference it seemed clear that she had acquired many of the skills, and much knowledge about community processes that we try to teach in this course.

J. had had such a long history of community involvement, had learned so much about the social welfare systems of Clark County that she applied for and was granted credit for an independent study in "Social Welfare Organization." Her eight years working with the CWC of Springfield and Clark County, her nine years with the Ohio Citizens Council, the various League studies, all have helped her to acquire a superior understanding of the social service delivery system in Springfield and Clark County, in Ohio, and probably an adequate one for the United States.

The 25 credits that were awarded to J.G. for the knowledge, skill, and understanding acquired from some ten years of community participation, were, I felt, as soundly based as are the credits earned by students in comparable courses in the Social Work Program. She received credit for Corrections, Issues in Social Welfare, Practicum I, Practicum II, and an independent study in Social Welfare Organization. She provided evidence in the form of studies and speeches. This was supplemented by some additional work that I asked for, and by a two-hour conference. During the conference my particular concern was to look for evidence not only that she had been involved in these various activities, but also that she understood their interrelationships, that she understood

basic principles that were related, and that she could apply those basic principles to different situations. There was absolutely no question in my mind that she could. She showed an alert and inquiring intellect that had made these connections as she went along. It was clear that she had read a great deal in the field. She had picked the brains of other people. She had learned to put facts together with concern that resulted in effective action.

Those are the goals we have for all the students in the Social Work Program at Antioch-Yellow Springs.

Case Study VII

In writing up a case study of an interview of a candidate for admission to the ADCP who was offering some kind of demonstrated learnings for academic credit, I reviewed the total process in which I have been involved, in order to have an outline which will describe the process of evaluation by the interviewer in its entirety. Upon reflection of a variety of experiences I have had in interviewing ADCP candidates, I came up with the following sequence of steps which I believe are important parts of the total process:

- Staff work preceding the interview between the ADCP candidate and the faculty member evaluating demonstrated learning.
- Preparation on the part of the ADCP candidate.
- Preparation on the part of the faculty member making an evaluation.
- The interview process.
- Criteria used in making the evaluation, and factors used in assessing the level of competence of the ADCP candidate.
- Items to be included in the evaluation report.

I will discuss each of these steps briefly.

Staff Work Preceding the Interview Between the ADCP Candidate and the

Faculty Member Evaluating Demonstrated Learning. This is perhaps the most important step in the total process, both in terms of ensuring that the student and program will be well served, and in terms of the efficient use of the faculty member's time, energy, and skill. The ADCP student needs to know: the scope of the ADCP offerings, within rather definite limits; the level of expectation of his background knowledge and intellectual ability; something of the range of style of teaching/learning that Antioch supports and, to some extent, what it does not support. The ADCP candidate should be advised to examine his reasons for undertaking the program and to state his goals as clearly and completely as he is able--preferably in writing. The candidate should be advised to examine his past experiences as fully as he is able and to state what he believes he has learned in terms of specific skills, bodies of knowledge, and processes of learning. Where possible these items should be stated in specific terms which are identifiable with established practices or disciplines. It is at this point that the advising by the staff is most critical; advice must be an artful balance between seeking identities connecting past experience with recognizable descriptions of them in conventional terms, and not closing-out possibilities for recognition of valid learning because it may be difficult to describe. The latter situation might be best dealt with by the staff advisor by being certain that the situation is passed along to the faculty member making the evaluation with a "flag," and as much interpretation of the situation as the staff advisor can describe. The staff should specify as fully as possible to a given ADCF candidate, the documents that the candidate should bring to the interview.

Preparation on the Part of the ADCP Candidate. If the candidate has taken

the advice of the staff seriously, the greatest part of his preparation for the interview is complete. He should have as much documentary material as he can reasonably obtain from his resources: a written outline of his reasons for pursuing the ADCP and his goals; evidence of any formal schooling beyond high school, including evaluations (grades) and course descriptions; samples of his work which show the scope and level of his knowledge or skills. In many cases, a selected set of samples of his work is preferable to the whole set of evidence he may have accumulated. A selected set of samples saves time in the review process; it indicates something of the values of the candidate, and it reveals something of his ability to differentiate various levels of his learning from among the total of his learning experiences.

Preparation on the Part of the Faculty Member Making an Evaluation. The faculty member making an evaluation of demonstrated learning of an ADCP candidate should know the full range of instructional resources of the College, at least in a general way; he should know the instructional resources of the area of the College closely allied to his own specialty well; he should know and agree with the general principles of operation and the objectives of the ADCP. In active preparation for the interview, he should read and think through (study) the documents prepared by the ADCP candidate that are forwarded to him by the staff. He should have a set of questions formulated in his mind (or on paper) to ask the candidate. The questions should center around such issues as: whether he, the faculty member, is the most appropriate person (from among the total faculty) to conduct the evaluation; identification of the candidate's reasons for pursuing the ADCP and the candidate's goals; review of the candidate's past experiences and the relationship of these experiences to specific skills,

bodies of knowledge, and processes of learning; identification of skills, knowledge, and processes of learning with courses of study within the scope of ADCP. The faculty member should give particular attention to the situations "flagged" and described by the staff. Questions that the faculty member should have in mind are ones that lead the candidate to discover relationships between his past experiences and learning, and elements of study within ADCP that the candidate did not think of himself--because he did not "know" the program at the time he reviewed and wrote up his past experiences. Particular questions the faculty member should have in mind are those that center on relationships between past learning experiences and the specific studies that the candidate intends to pursue in the ADCP. On the one hand these should determine whether the demonstrated learning ties in so closely with the candidate's intended studies that his total program is too narrow; or on the other hand, whether demonstrated learning is so unrelated to his intended studies that they may be considered irrelevant to his goals for pursuing the ADCP. In the latter case, the demonstrated learning may be examined in terms of the candidate's general education, and questions should be formulated for assessing the value of this demonstrated learning for fulfilling general education requirements.

The Interview Process. This is a function of each individual candidate. Some candidates take the initiative and present a well-defined and coherent outline of their intended studies and their past experience. In this case, the faculty member may just listen, comparing the statements of the candidate to the set of questions he has previously formulated. The faculty member then asks any questions about areas not touched upon by the candidate. Documents brought

by the candidate may be examined and questions may be asked to verify the details of scope and level of the candidate's experience and learning.

Some candidates take a passive role in the interview process and, in this case, the previously-formulated set of questions in the faculty member's mind becomes indispensable to the achievement of a thorough examination of the candidate's experience and learning--in a reasonable period of time. The documents and set of sample materials brought by the candidate are important aids in asking sensible questions and getting answers that can be evaluated in terms of demonstrated learning.

Most candidates fall somewhere between these two cases of behavior in the interview process and the faculty member may be more or less active in directing the interview. Here again, a formulated set of questions in the mind of the faculty member will help ensure that coverage of the candidate's learning experience will have broad enough scope to give the candidate fair credit for what he has learned, while at the same time satisfying any doubts in the mind of the faculty member about the level of learning being demonstrated.

Criteria Used in Making the Evaluation and Factors Used in Assessing the Level of Competence of the ADCP Candidate. Each faculty member has a general set of criteria which he brings to the evaluation process of a candidate's learning. While these sets may be different for any faculty member, they generally contain elements which are common among the sets of different faculty members. Ability to read, write, and express concepts in quantitative terms are included in most sets of criteria. As such, these abilities provide a base upon which an evaluation can be made. The documents provided by the candidate, his statements, and answers to questions should be examined for his ability to use these three basic areas of communication. The experience of each candidate

will be an important mold for determining the criteria selected for evaluating demonstrated learning, and experiences should be examined particularly for the elements of learning which are common to those of established studies in the ADCP. Any other elements of learning from the candidate's experiences should be examined for relationships that may be connections with elements of learning of established studies in the ADCP. In this way, new concepts of what is studied, or what may be studied, can be discovered. (The faculty member may thus increase his knowledge of the learning that is possible within the existing scope of studies of ADCP.)

The level of competence of the demonstrated learning of the ADCP candidate may be assessed: in terms of its position with respect to a set of hierarchical prerequisites, in the case of courses taken; in terms of levels of difficulty of the examination, in cases of civil-service employment; in terms of levels of assigned responsibility, in cases of a statement from a reference; in terms of responses to a level-graded quiz on a subject given on the spot by the faculty member making the evaluation; the faculty member making an evaluation may give the candidate a regular examination on the subject area being evaluated.

Items to be Included in the Evaluation Report. As a minimum the evaluation report should contain: a list of the contents of the candidate's area of demonstrated learning; a description of the process used in making the evaluation; a statement of assessment of the candidate's demonstrated learning. Additional information that can be helpful in the total process of the candidate's studies in ADCP includes: recommendations for specific subjects for study, and the level at which the candidate should study in the subject area.

Case Study VIII

The following pertains to an independent study, but the exchange of information and the subject matter seem pertinent to assessment of prior learning.

It was an afternoon phone call, "Hi B., do you remember me, P.E.?" I hastened to assure her that I certainly did remember her and her husband. After all, they were both outstanding students and we had kept in touch by annual notes for several years after they left Antioch, he graduating in 1959, she leaving Yellow Springs with him after only two years at Antioch. It was on to a variety of jobs for J.E. including several years in the Orient where P. began to raise their three children and where they adopted a young Vietnamese orphan just before they left. This latter came out in our first phone conversation. I quickly learned that she was in Yellow Springs to try and arrange for the completion of her college education under our new Adult Degree Completion Program. She had already had a lengthy conference with her major academic advisor in Psychology and needed to see me about a possible general education course in the Physical Sciences. Much preferring face-to-face conversation to phone calls, I asked her to come over to my office to discuss the course.

The family was now comfortably settled on a one-hundred acre farm in Wisconsin. Most of the "farm" was woods, and the only large field they were renting to a nearby farmer. P. wanted to grow much of the family vegetables, organically if possible, so I suggested we work up a course since we had been offering such a course for several years on an independent study basis. I must admit to some reservations about organic gardening as there is much in the organic food literature that doesn't appeal to my scientific training and critical mind. I discussed this with P., and she accepted my bias. We worked out a reading program and agreed on the plan of her notebook, dates of check-up, and completion of a final report. My main aim was to have her read about soils and nutrients.

Vascular plants are basically water hydrants squirting water up into the air and their first need after a place to sit, is water. After that we start worrying about nutrients of which the major one is nitrogen. We discussed composting as a source of soil conditioning and nutrients (little or no nitrogen, the acidity, need for liming to make the nitrogen available, and so on.)

Armed with the forms and her books, P. was off to Wisconsin ready for the spring planting. I think she was glad to be on her way home as her VW Bug had taken a beating in the tennisball hail storm we watched from my front porch--the northern side of the tornado that devastated Xenia. I was delighted to have P. and her son stay with me two nights while she was getting the rest of her work arranged. We had time to discuss gardens and plants and my rather unorthodox views on "viewing" gardens. My vegetable garden is in the front yard, my "viewing" garden in the side and back yard.

Within three weeks of her departure I received my first progress report--things were happening, but all was not well. The plants she mulched were not growing as rapidly as the unmulched controls--mulched too soon and that kept the soil cold. Also some unknown bug was eating a lot of the plants. Again, mulched too soon and the sow bugs and slugs hiding in the cool dampness of the mulch were having a feast at night. Get a flashlight and check for the critters before you go to bed. Later the drought set in, and her lower garden stopped as she could not water it, but the one near the house continued to prosper.

Well, as neither of us had foreseen, I was going on a canoe trip to Wisconsin at the end of spring quarter, so we arranged for a firsthand inspection of the gardens and an oral examination instead of a final written report. When I saw the condition of the soil--it is a beautiful farm set in the rolling hammocky hills of glacial morraines and an esker yet--my heart sank. The slopes,

the reddish clay pulverized with rocks. It could be made into a productive farm, but the cost would be prohibitive. We discussed the situation and agreed that it would be best left in woods that could be selectively harvested for hardwood or pulp. The two lower meadows could support a couple of horses and with continued de-rocking and conditioning, the house garden could be made more productive. Mulching, especially digging it in after the growing season, liming to bring up the Ph, and use of horse manure for the nitrogen would do the trick.

In three more weeks I'll be off again for a canoe trip in Wisconsin and I'll check out the garden again. I think I'm learning as much from this course as P.

V. SOME QUESTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND QUALITY CONTROL

This review is to alert faculty to some questions of educational policy and quality control they might face when crediting non-academically acquired learning.

When the Antioch-Yellow Springs faculty began to grant such credit we found ourselves making decisions for which there were no clear educational policies previously agreed upon by our colleagues. When we met together to review our program a number of questions were raised about the decisions we were making. Some were answered easily once we compared views, but others only tentatively and are still under examination. Below is a summary of these considerations.

These questions arise in part from the requests made by ADCP candidates seeking demonstrated learning credit, and most likely will be faced by faculty at other institutions, but the questions also are determined to some extent by two fundamentals of our particular Adult Degree Completion Program: (1) the requirements for the ADCP are the same as for all our regular undergraduates and are not new and different ones, and (2) we grant credit for specific things learned through non-academic experiences, but not for time spent in an activity per se. To the extent that other institutions have other starting points, the questions they face may be different.

A. What Kinds of Non-Academically Acquired Learnings Are Appropriate to the Degree?

Many of our students sought credit for things customarily taught at either our institution or other colleges that our faculty respect. These cases gave us no problem; the means for evaluation were familiar and handy. We did find,

however, three kinds of new situations that needed examination:

1. Learning of conventional topics but with unconventional emphasis on the aspect learned, usually a heavy emphasis on practical skills and practical information to the expense of general conceptions and theory.

Examples are: the student who through work in nurseries and landscape gardening had picked up much information appropriate to botany, but who had no real concept of that field and no context for systematizing his knowledge; or the student who had been taught a number of behavior modification techniques at an institution for retarded children and who could apply them sensitively and judiciously but who had no understanding of the theoretical background of those techniques or of alternative techniques and theories; or the student who through extensive work on a police force had become so effective in handling mobs non-violently that he had been in charge of training other police officers.

In such cases the practical knowledge and skills are not only appropriate to college work, but often are greater than that acquired in the usual college course in botany, behavior therapy, or social psychology. (How many social psychologists are able to deal effectively with a mob?) What is lacking is the background and context that gives this knowledge the generality needed. The procedure we use in these cases is requiring an additional or follow-up course, in which the student learns that background knowledge and relates it to his previous experience. For example, the student who came with the behavior modification training was asked to study the theoretical approaches to behavior therapy, and then analyze and evaluate the procedures used at the institution where he was trained. Credit for the practical learning was made contingent upon the additional study, and credit was then given for both it and the additional work.

2. Learning unusual for the typical curriculum. Frequently students

request credit for less traditional types of learning. Examples: Complete and accurate rote memory of the Ohio Traffic Code by rule and number; skill in publicizing and promoting a political candidate; skills in dealing with one's own children.

In deciding whether or not to credit any particular instance of learning our general rule has been to insist that the knowledge is systematic and conceptual, that it goes beyond the particular to encompass general principles applicable in diverse situations, or at least that the student is asked to make use of the learned material to reach those ends. There are two general ways of doing the latter; either requiring a follow-up course as described above, or planning the student's program so that such knowledge plays a logical part in it. This is more easily done within the major field. For example, work in political campaigns might be appropriate for a student of journalism or political science, but not for an art major (though there are those who would disagree). It is important neither to reject a kind of learning simply because it is not something our curriculum has previously included, nor to accept anything just because it has been learned; the quality of a program depends not only on sound criteria for saying yes, but also on the existence of criteria for saying no. At any college, the faculty must establish these criteria to their satisfaction.

Credit requests for emotional development, personal insights, changes of attitude--the kinds of learning that comes from psychotherapy, workshops in parent effectiveness, encounter groups--present particularly difficult problems. They are not so bad if the credit sought is for the development of skills in dealing with people, in counseling, or of the knowledge of the theoretical bases of the therapy. That kind of substance is at least familiar, though

perhaps the skills are not easily assessed. But often personal insights or attitude changes, leading to a new self acceptance, while of great significance to the individual (and most commendable) are based on the acquisition of the most trivial substantive knowledge. Those faculty members who view such emotional learning as the happy by-product of education prefer not to give it college credit; those who see such development as a significant part of education wish to credit it, although many would want to limit the amount to a fixed portion of a student's required credits. Even when faculty agree and such credit is given, it is very difficult to evaluate the quality of the learning.

Our tendency has been to encourage this kind of learning, but to reserve academic credit for the learning of the most substantive knowledge and skills that often accompany it.

3. Learning appropriate to the degree but of unusual amounts. Sometimes a student has reached a degree of expertise beyond what one would expect at the undergraduate level. This is likely to happen in areas such as physical education, music, and art. If the competence is in the area of the student's major, the amount of credit is contingent only on the kind and amount of additional work required by the particular academic department the student is in. But, if the expertise is not in the student's major field, how much credit should be allowed? If a pianist has advanced skill through years of non-credited instruction and practice, how many credits should he receive? Regular undergraduates rarely take more than about five-ten credits of piano instruction. Our practice has been to grant the expert about the same maximum number of credits an ordinary undergraduate could receive, but to be willing to grant more, provided that doing so does not replace other instruction more sensible for the student's total program. In practice, this has been an infrequent

problem.

B. What Amounts of Credit Should be Given for Non-Academic Learning?

The problem of converting non-academic learning into specific numbers of credits has not been as difficult for us as we had expected. If the credit is to be given for specific things learned and not for time spent, the faculty member evaluating the work usually can find some basis for equating the amount of learning to that normally expected in regular courses and practicums. A more troublesome problem lies in deciding whether to put a limit on the total number of non-academically acquired credits that can be used toward the degree. Many of our candidates have led such long and active lives that they have amassed a potentially excessive number of credits. To resist attempts to have us convert all such learning into college credit, we usually limit the credit granted to the amounts which, when added to their previous and current college work, are needed to complete the degree. While such amounts are often less than what the student might possibly receive, it not only saves us a great deal of time and effort, but promotes better advising; the student and the faculty advisor focusing their attention on the student's past learning which is most important to his current educational needs.

There are occasionally students who see their lives as having been worthwhile only if converted into college credits. These individuals are rare, fortunately, but if we are not in the business of certifying the value of lives, we must resist all such tendencies when we meet them.

VI. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

ADCP Form 3-A

DEMONSTRATED LEARNING CREDITING

CANDIDATE: _____

TO THE EVALUATOR: If you are crediting the candidate, please do the following: 1) Complete this form at the end of your conference and before the candidate leaves. 2) Keep the last copy for your records. 3) Give the other copies and the unused Form 3-B to the candidate to return to the ADCP Office.

_____ is to be credited for demonstrated learning as follows:
(Candidate's Name)

Dept.	Course No.	Course Title	Credits

SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGES OR SKILLS DEMONSTRATED:

METHOD(s) OF DEMONSTRATION:

INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION:

Faculty signature: _____

Print Name: _____

Date: _____

ADCP Form 3-B

DEMONSTRATED LEARNING AGREEMENTS

CANDIDATE: _____

TO THE EVALUATOR: If you will not be crediting the above candidate until further work has been completed, please do the following: 1) Complete this form at the end of your conference and before the candidate leaves. 2) Keep the last copy and the unused, Form 3-A, for your records. 3) Give the other copies of this form to the candidate to return to the ADCP Office.

Dept.	Course No.	Course Title	Credits

WHAT SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE OR SKILL ALREADY HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED:

METHOD(s) OF DEMONSTRATION:

INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATION TO DATE:

WORK TO BE COMPLETED (including any agreements about deadlines, etc.):

Faculty signature: _____

Print Name: _____

Date: _____

ADCP Form 3-A

DEMONSTRATED LEARNING CREDIT

CANDIDATE: Mrs. M.W.

TO THE EVALUATOR: If you are crediting the candidate, please do the following: 1) Complete this form at the end of your conference and before the candidate leaves. 2) Keep the last copy for your records. 3) Give the other copies and the unused Form 3-B to the candidate to return to the ADCP Office.

Mrs. M.W. is to be credited for demonstrated learning as follows:
(Candidate's Name)

Physical Education	156	Elements of Teaching Dance	5.0
Dept.	Course No.	Course Title	Credits

SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGES OR SKILLS DEMONSTRATED:

Ability to teach ballet at beginning and intermediate levels.

METHOD(s) OF DEMONSTRATION:

Mrs. W. taught a sample class - discussed goals of teaching, including what is appropriate pacing for the class, for various levels, etc. She submitted written class plans and copious evidence in writing of years of teaching and running her own school.

INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION:

It was obvious that Mrs. W. has taught for years. She knows her material, understands alignment, understands the problems of communicating material to students, understands how to work muscially. She is a professional.

Faculty signature: D. R., Assistant Professor, Physical Education
Date: April 24, 1975

ADCP Form 3-B

DEMONSTRATED LEARNING AGREEMENTS

CANDIDATE: Mrs. A. H.

TO THE EVALUATOR: If you will not be crediting the above candidate until further work has been completed, please do the following: 1) Complete this form at the end of your conference and before the candidate leaves. 2) Keep the last copy and the unused, Form 3-A, for your records. 3) Give the other copies of this form to the candidate to return to the ADCP Office.

Psychology	306	Introduction to Counseling Methods	5.0
Dept.	Course No.	Course Title	Credits

WHAT SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE OR SKILL ALREADY HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED?

Mrs. H. obviously has had a good bit of formal and informal counseling experience with parents of nursery school children as well as trainees in various Peace Corps programs. Perhaps more important than experience is her interest in people and her own personal warmth. I have the impression that she would be able to establish a good working relationship relatively easily. She does not profess to be proficient with emotional problems but my course is an overview of many different kinds of counseling.

METHOD(s) OF DEMONSTRATION:

Oral interview.

INSTRUCTOR'S EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATION TO DATE:

I will be quite satisfied to give five credits for my course when Mrs. H. has fulfilled the requirement to which we agreed. Quality of the work performed is of course a consideration.

WORK TO BE COMPLETED (including any agreements about deadlines, etc.):

Mrs. H. has agreed to write what would be a term paper in my course, using her own experience with parents of pre-schoolers and also doing some research in the area. This is due by December 20, 1974.

Faculty signature: M. S. K., Associate Professor, Psychology Department
Date: November 11, 1974

TO: Graduates of the Miami Valley Hospital School of Nursing

FROM: Antioch College/Yellow Springs Adult Degree Completion Program Committee

RE: How the Adult Degree Completion Program (ADCP) applies to you.

If you have completed the Miami Valley Hospital School of Nursing curriculum, and have passed the state R.N. examinations, you can earn either a BA or a BS degree by completing only fifty (50) to fifty-five (55) credits in the Adult Degree Completion Program at Antioch-Yellow Springs. Indeed, if you enter this program, you already will have completed the requirements for a major in Human Biology if you wish to receive a BA. To receive the BS, you will need to take other science courses in addition to your field of concentration (Human Biology) which you already will have completed.

All the credits you earned at Wright State University or any other college or university, with a grade of "C" or better, will count toward the Antioch degree. In addition, the appropriate Antioch faculty have examined the courses you took at the Miami Valley Hospital School of Nursing and have agreed that, by successfully completing the program there, you already have demonstrated the knowledge and skills necessary to receive academic credit for the following courses:

ADMINISTRATION

Organization Design and Decision Making	5 cr.

BIOLOGY

Pharmacology	6 cr.
Physical Development of the Child	5 cr.
Nutrition in Health and Disease	5 cr.
Human Hygiene	8 cr.
Medical Physiology I, II	15 cr.
Practicum: Nursing I, II, III	15 cr.

PSYCHOLOGY

Prenatal and Neonatal Development	5 cr.

PSYCHOLOGY or SOCIAL WORK

Interpersonal Relationships in the Medical Setting	5 cr.
Mental Health Practicum in a Medical Setting I, II	10 cr.
Community Health Practicum I, II	10 cr.

In addition to the academic credits which you already will have earned should you enter the ADCP, you will have earned, through your clinical experience as a student, three (3) of the eight (8) work credits required for the Antioch degree. Any work in which you have engaged since your graduation from MVHSN also will provide work credits at the rate of one for each three months of experience. You can, of course, continue to work while in the ADCP.

The length of time it will take you to earn the Antioch degree will depend upon the amount of time you are able to devote to study. Minimally, if you have worked for at least fifteen months since graduation (thus completing the work credit requirements) and can study full time, you could complete degree requirements in three quarters. Maximally, if you intend to work full time during the entire period you are studying, and can manage to carry only five (5) academic credits per quarter, it will take ten (10) quarters (two and a half years) to complete degree requirements. It is probable that most of you will work out study plans with your academic advisers which lead to completion of degree work at some point between these two extremes.

Because of Antioch's special arrangements with the Miami Valley Hospital School of Nursing, the ADCP Committee is willing to waive the admission requirements for graduates of the MVHSN.

Because of the transfer and demonstrated learning credits which you already will have earned if you enter the ADCP, and because that program requires that you earn at least fifty (50) credits while in it, you will graduate from Antioch with more than the usual requirement of 160 credits. This should not be a disadvantage to you, however. Indeed, many of our undergraduates who are not members of the ADCP deliberately decide to earn more credits than are required so they can accomplish academic learning which they deem individually desirable.

LVS:sg

ADCP Form 6

DEGREE PROGRAM AGREEMENTS

CANDIDATE: _____

MAJOR FIELD: _____ ADVISER: _____

TO THE ADVISER: Please do the following, in quadruplicate, during your pre-admission conference with the candidate named above: 1) Complete all sections; 2) Sign, and ask the candidate to sign, where indicated; 3) Give three copies to the candidate, one to keep and two to be delivered by him/her to the ADCP Office; 4) Keep one copy for your records.

I. NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF CREDITS ALREADY EARNED (OR TO BE CERTIFIED AS EARNED):

Distribution		Transfer Credits	Demonstrated Learning Credits
General Education:	Humanities	_____	_____
	Physical Sciences	_____	_____
	Social Sciences	_____	_____
Major Field:		_____	_____
Electives:		_____	_____
	TOTALS	_____	_____

TOTAL CREDITS ALREADY EARNED: _____

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLETION OF DEGREE

A. Number and Distribution of Credits

General Education:	Humanities	_____credits
	Physical Sciences	_____credits
	Social Sciences	_____credits
Major Field:		_____credits
Electives:		_____credits

TOTAL CREDITS TO BE EARNED: _____

B. Specific Courses (if any) and Credits

General Education:

Major Field:

III. COURSES RECOMMENDED FOR COMPLETION OF DEGREE REQUIREMENTS. The following courses, while recommended for, or desired by the named candidate, are not specifically required for completion of his/her degree. The adviser and the candidate may agree upon substitutions at any time during the candidate's membership in the ADCP

A. General Education:

B. Major Field:

C. Electives:

IV. MANNER OF COMPLETING REQUIREMENTS. Please check the appropriate blank.

____ Entirely by study on campus.

____ Entirely by study away from campus.

____ The following probable combination of study on and away from campus:

_____

_____

____ Other. Please describe: _____

_____

V. EXPECTED STUDY QUARTERS. Please check all that apply, including the quarter when it is probable that the candidate will be completing degree requirements.

1973-74: ____Spring

1974-75: _____Summer _____Fall ____Winter ____Spring

1975-76: _____Summer _____Fall ____Winter ____Spring

1976-77: _____Summer _____Fall ____Winter ____Spring

VI. SPECIFIC PLANNING OF FIRST STUDY QUARTER.

A. Regularly Offered Courses

Dept.	Course Number	Course Title	Credits	On Campus	Off Campus

B. Independent Study Courses

Dept.	Course Number	Course Title	Credits	On Campus	Off Campus

C. Other Plans:

VII. SPECIFIC AGREEMENTS ABOUT HOW PLANNING FOR SUBSEQUENT STUDY QUARTERS WILL BE DONE. Please specify below the way, or combination of ways, in which the adviser and candidate will plan study quarters subsequent to the first one.

III. FURTHER AGREEMENTS ABOUT COMPLETION OF DEGREE REQUIREMENTS. Please state briefly and specifically any further agreements the adviser and the candidate have reached.

Signatures: _____ _____
(Adviser) (Candidate)

Date: _____

CAEL INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS

No. 1	The Use of Expert Judgment In The Assessment Of Demonstrated Learning In The Antioch College Yellow Springs Adult Degree Completion Program	$2.00
No. 2	Interpersonal Learning In An Academic Setting: Theory and Practice	$2.00
No. 3	Evaluation and Expert Judgment	$2.00
No. 4	The Refinement and Modification Of An Instrument For Assessing The Achievement of Interpersonal Skills of Social Work Students	$2.00
No. 5	Guidelines and Procedures For The Assessment Of Experiential Learning and For The Selection and Training Of Field Experts	$2.00